

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1-27. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-27.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to contact Applicants' Attorney, the undersigned, by telephone so as to discuss the outstanding issues of the present application prior to examination based on the present Amendment.

The title of the invention stands objected to as not being descriptive. The title of the invention was changed to "METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR REMOTELY CONTROLLING A TERMINAL BY A CONTROL TERMINAL AND STORING CONTROL HISTORY INFORMATION AT THE TERMINAL BEING REMOTELY CONTROLLED ", which Applicants submit is descriptive of the present invention. Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) by Applicants' alleged admitted prior art; claims 3-12 and 18-27 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' alleged admitted prior art in view of Tingley (U.S. Patent No. 6,708,211); and claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' alleged admitted prior art in view of Middleton (WO 99/13423). These rejections are traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 1-27 are not taught or suggested by Applicants, Tingley or Middleton whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the

Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

Amendments were made to claims 1-27 to more describe features of the present invention. Particularly, amendments were claims 1-27 to more clearly recite that the present invention is directed to a terminal to be remotely controlled from a distant control terminal through a communication network, the distant control terminal remotely controlling the terminal through the communication network and a remote operation history recording for use in a computer system having the terminal and the distant control terminal.

According to the present invention, the terminal includes means for receiving a remote operation message from the distant control terminal through the communication network, means for entering remote operation input information extracted from the received remote operation message into an operating system and history recording means for recording the remote operation input information and transition of display on a terminal display screen at the terminal being remotely controlled by the distant control terminal in response to the remote operation input information as remote control history data.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Particularly, the above described features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Applicants' alleged admitted prior art, Tingley or Middleton whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

In the Office Action the Examiner alleges that Applicants' alleged admitted prior art as discussed in the Background of the Invention section of the present application teaches the history recording means as recited in the claims. The Examiner is completely error in this regard and has mis-described the discussion of Applicants' alleged admitted prior art in order to meet the limitations of the present invention as recited in the claims. Particularly, the alleged history recording means as discussed in the Background of the Invention section of the present application is not provided at the terminal being remotely controlled as in the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

For example, the Background of the Invention section of the present application as set forth on page 2, lines 16-29 describes that:

"remote control operation history information indicating the transition of displayed contents due to the operators input operations is stored at the control terminal and a sequence of operations is reproduced at the control terminal as required".

Thus, as is quite clear from the above noted passage of the present application, the Background of the Invention as recited in the claims teaches quite the opposite of (teaches away from) that as recited in the claims. Specifically, the Background of the Invention as recited in the claims simply provides that the remote control operation history information is stored at the control terminal which controls a remote terminal. At no point is there any description in the Background of the Invention section of the present application that the remote control operation history information is stored at the remotely controlled terminal as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Storing the remote control operation history information at the terminal being remotely controlled allows for the user at the terminal being remotely controlled to inspect and monitor any activities being remotely conducted on his terminal. Such is not possible in the apparatus as described in the Background of the Invention section of the present application and as such provides a disadvantage to which the present invention is overcome.

Thus, Applicants' alleged admitted prior art fails to teach or suggest a terminal to be remotely controlled from a distant control terminal through a communication network, wherein the distant control terminal remotely controls the terminal through the communication network and history recording means for recording the remote operation input information and transmission of display on a terminal display screen at the terminal being remotely controlled by the distant control terminal in response to the remote operation input information as remote control history data as recited in the claims.

Therefore, Applicants' alleged admitted prior art fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 2 and 15-17 as being anticipated by Applicants' alleged admitted prior art is respectfully requested.

The above described deficiencies of Applicants' alleged admitted prior art are not supplied by any of the other references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Particularly, the above described features of the present invention shown above not to be taught or suggested by Applicants' alleged admitted prior art are also not taught or suggested by Tingley and Middleton. Therefore, combining the teachings of

Applicants' alleged admitted prior art with one or more of Tingley and Middleton still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Tingley intends to track, record and control the use of company-owned computer applications so that management personnel can control the use of company-owned technology in a non-invasive manner. In the Summary Of The Invention section thereof, Tingley proposes:

“checking a set of characters and values in a memory area of a computer unit (operated by a user);

capturing each set of characters and values to determine each state activated by the user which corresponds to a Windows frame state, a dialog box state or keyboard buffer state;

writing each set of captured characters and values in a real-time ASC command signal file; and

transmitting the ASC command signal file to a second computer unit that allows management personnel to view the current operations of all network users simultaneously.”

The second computer unit, not the computer unit being remotely controlled, as taught by Tingley allows for further processing so that information relating to each state activated by each network user may be viewed and further analyzed at a later date. Attention is directed to col. 1, line 62 to col. 2, line 20 of Tingley.

Tingley, further proposes, to transfer a user profile from an administrator computer unit to a user computer unit to control the computer environment of a user of the client computer unit so that a user lock

application stored in the client computer unit is initiated by the user profile to halt user activity if the activity of the user violates the user profile.

According to the present invention as recited in the claims, the remote controlled terminal has history recording means for recording the remote operation input information at the remote controlled terminal as remote control history data. Using the remote control history data, the user of the remote controlled terminal can check the details of remote operations conducted by another person from the control terminal at the remote controlled terminal.

On the contrary, an object of Tingley is to monitor the user operations carried out on the client computer unit at the administrator computer unit or second computer unit. Tingley proposes to transfer the user operations in the form of a real-time ASC command signal file to the administrator computer unit and to store the file at the administrator computer unit, thereby to analyze the user's activity later.

Although the Examiner states that Tingley teaches hooking means for capturing information supplied from the operating system to an application program and a display controller, Tingley does not use the hooking means for the purpose of capturing information to be recorded in a remote control history file at the remote controlled terminal as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

In Tingley's, network configuration, the client computer unit does not correspond to the remote controlled terminal of the present invention as recited in the claims, because the client computer unit does not receive remote operation input information (or a remote operation message) from a control terminal, that is to be entered into an operating system, and the client

computer unit does not record the remote operation input information at the client computer as remote control history data as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Thus, Tingley, the same as Applicants' alleged admitted prior art, fails to teach or suggest a terminal to be remotely controlled from a distant control terminal through a communication network, wherein the distant control terminal remotely controls the terminal through the communication network and history recording means in the terminal for recording the remote operation input information and transmission of display on a terminal display screen at the terminal being remotely controlled by the distant control terminal in response to the remote operation input information as remote control history data as recited in the claims.

Therefore, since both Applicants' alleged admitted prior art and Tingley fail to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now recited in the claims, the combination of Applicants' alleged admitted prior art and Tingley does not render obvious the features of the present invention as now recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 3-12 and 18-27 as being unpatentable over Applicants' alleged admitted prior art in view of Tingley is respectfully requested.

Further to the above described arguments with respect to Applicants' alleged admitted prior art, it is also submitted that the features of the present invention as recited in claims 13 and 14 are not taught or suggested by Applicants' alleged admitted prior art. Particularly, claims 13 and 14 of the present application recite a remote operation history recording method for use

in a computer system wherein a step is provided of storing, as operation history data, event information indicating the results of the program operation at the remote controlled terminal and a step is provided for storing, as operation history data, event information generated according to the remote operation information at the remote controlled terminal. These steps are clearly not taught or suggested by Applicants' alleged admitted prior art.

As shown above, Applicants' alleged admitted prior art simply provides for the storage at the control terminal, not the remote controlled terminal, remote control operation history information. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in Applicants' alleged admitted prior art that such information is stored at the remote control terminal being controlled by a controlling terminal as in the present invention as recited in the claims. Thus, Applicants' alleged admitted prior art teaches away from the features of the present invention as recited in the claims.

The above described deficiencies of Applicants' alleged admitted prior art are not supplied by Middleton. Middleton intends to make it possible for advertisers on Web pages to find a way to more precisely gauge a user's interest in a product, as well as to entice those users who are casually browsing through the World Wide Web, without actually requiring users to download the advertiser's Web page. Attention is directed to page 3, lines 10-17 of Middleton.

Middleton describes at page 6, lines 16-30 that:

"the client computers 20 allow a user to view Web pages 16 by downloading replica Web page files 40 to the client computer 20a from the server computer 12a over communication media 14. The Web page files 40 enable replication of the Web page 16 on the client computer 20a. The

downloading function is specifically performed by browser program 28, which preferably includes browser program software. These browser programs include and/or permit the use of embedded interpretive language 30, such as Java, that may execute programs that are includes in the Web page file 16".

Middleton further describes at page 7, line 27 through page 28, line 9 that:

"in accordance with the present invention, the Java code 44 includes an applet program and data for tracking and logging the activities of the user in memory 24 while the user is viewing the Web page replica 40. The applet program 44 therefore permits the authors of the advertisement 39 to better understand how the users interest with the Web page advertisement in order to provide more attentive advertisement. Once the Web page replica 40 begins to display, the applet 44 also begins to execute in order to track and/or log user activities as they relate to various parts or objects of the advertisement 39)".

As per the above, the flowchart of FIG.2 of Middleton, the applet program 44 collects log information (activity log 60) indicating user activities on the display detected before a user clicks a mouse to download a different Web page, such am mouse hover, a cursor location, elapsed time, etc.

In Middleton, the applet program 44 sends the activity log 60 from a local memory 24 to a server 12b at certain times. The server 12b is associated with the advertiser and may be the same server 12a from which the Web page 46 was originally downloaded. The activity log is preferably sent to the server 12h via a dummy HTTP GET message sent via a back channel to the server 12b at the time that the user leaves the present page 40. Attention is directed to page 10, line 27 to page 11, lines 6 of Middleton.

Accordingly, Middleton states at page 11, lines 22-27 that:

“what is important is that the logged interaction data is eventually flushed to the server 12b, so that the author of the advertisement 39 may occasionally check on the collection 62 of activity logs stored at the server 12b and analyze the data in order to determine the effectiveness of the advertisement 39”.

Since Middleton regards a client-server system, the client computer 20a on which the applet program runs acts as a control terminal, and the Web server acts as a remote controlled terminal. In this case, the dummy HTTP GET message including the activity log, that is sent from the client computer (control terminal) to the Web server 12a (or server 12b) and stored in the server, corresponds to neither the remote operation message including remote operation input information to be sent from a control terminal to a remote controlled terminal in the present invention, nor the message indicating the results of execution of the program operation in the present invention.

It should be noted that according to the present invention the latter message is one to be sent from the remote controlled terminal to the control terminal after the remote controlled terminal executes a program operation according to the remote operation input information received from the control terminal. On the contrary, Middleton sends the dummy HTTP GET message from the control terminal (client) to the remote controlled terminal (server).

Further, the dummy HTTP GET message does not indicate the result of program operation executed in response to the remote operation input information received from the control terminal (client), but indicates behavior of the cursor on the display detected by the applet program, which has no

relation to the remote input operation to be stored as operation history data in the present invention.

Thus, Middleton, the same as Applicants' alleged admitted prior art, fails to teach or suggest storing as operation history data, event information generated according to the remote operation input information at the remote controlled terminal and storing, as operation history data, event information indicating the results of the operation program at the remote control terminal as recited in the claims.

Therefore, since both Applicants' alleged admitted prior art and Middleton fail to teach or suggest the same features of the present invention as recited in the claims, combining Applicants' alleged admitted prior art and Middleton in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 13 and 14 as being unpatentable over Applicants' alleged admitted prior art and Middleton is respectfully requested.


The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 1-27.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 1-27 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-27 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (520.39905X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120